

DRAFT
IACC MEETING MINUTES
Training Room 2 East/West, CalEPA Building, 2nd Floor
1001 I Street, Sacramento
Tuesday, October 15, 2002

ATTENDEES: Clay Brandow, CDF; Jarma Bennett, SWRCB; Thomas Filler, SWRCB; Barbara Todd, CDFA; Kathy Brunetti, CDPR; Michael August, DPR; Stephen Fagundes, SWRCB; Sam Harader, CalFED; Al Wanger, CCC; Trinda Bedrossian, DOC; Janna Shackeroff, CCC; Claudia Moore, CIWMB; Jessie Smith, SWRCB; Bill Ryan, DTSC; Dale Hopkins, RB2; Gary Fregien, DPR; Ken Decio, CIWMB; Dana Stokes, CIWMB; Cy Oggins, SLC; Margie Lopez Read, SWRCB.
TELEPHONE ATTENDEES: Sorrel Marks, RB3; Nadim Zewyar, RB7; Cindy Rofer-Wise, RB6; Raymond Jay, RB4; Lisa Sniderman, BCDC.

I. INTRODUCTION & ANNOUNCEMENTS

Brief announcements included the fact that the NPS and IACC web sites are now linked to the opening session of the SWRCB web page.

Database: Please advise Margie Read or Jessie Smith if you have not received a copy of the database and instructions. All agencies should have received it by now. If there is any need for training or special help with the database, please contact Margie Read.

All agencies should be considering the development of a formal progress report for their first 5-year plan implementation. This progress report should be due during the summer of 2003, but no schedule or template has been arranged to date.

CalFED has now become an official part of the Resources Agency, and as of January 1, will be called the California Bay Delta Authority (CBDA?). Each unit (division?) within CBDA will also have advisory agencies, such as State Board, DOHS, and USEPA. There will be a governing Board for the Authority composed of about 22 individuals to be appointed soon.

II. WATERSHED MANAGEMENT STRATEGY DISCUSSION

The Watershed Management Strategic Planning interview was lead by Renee Hoyos, Special Assistant for Watersheds & Outreach with the Resources Agency. A summary of the interview will be prepared and can be provided upon request. Information on certain web sites were requested by IACC members from Renee Hoyos, and they are as follows:

Funding database: www.crawdadfunds.org

New Zealand reorganization on watershed boundaries: <http://www.rri.org/home.html>

Watershed information database: www.ice.ucdavis.edu/r/nrpi

III. DEFINING TERMS FOR PROGRAM PLANNING

The levels of Objectives and definition of some of the terms that will be used in the 5-Year Implementation Plan were discussed. Also included in the discussion were the examples that were provided in an effort to clarify the various definitions. The group decided to create an activity and

build upon it for objectives, MM, MM Objectives, on up. It was quite evident that there still was some disparity and variety for the way that these terms are interpreted and utilized.

The test examples was as follows, with some of the terms being unassigned for this example:

1. Activity: Fencing drainages in North Bay aqueduct ditches
2. Activity Objective: Fence pastures, keep cattle from the watershed, and cut down on pollutants
3. Management Measures: Erosion & Sediment Control, and Grazing Management
4. MM Objective: Reduce pollution from grazing livestock
5. MM Success Measure:
6. Category: Agriculture
7. Category Performance Measure:

There were some suggestions for the process as follows:

- To define some consistency in Activity Naming to make database searching more fruitful
- To use the terms Who, What, When, Where, Why and How for clarification. This could be as follows:

Who: The agencies leading the activity (Lead Agency)

What: The activity (Activity Name)

When: The time frame for the activity (Activity Start Date, End Date)

Where: The location for the activity (Activity Location, and Watershed)

Why: The objective for the activity (Activity Objective)

How: The manner in which the activity objective will be achieved (Activity Description)

All of these fields currently exist in the database.

3. The only terms that agencies need to be concerned about at this point are numbers 1, 2, 3, and 6 listed above. The other terms can be decided via the category subcommittee processes.

IV. SUB-COMMITTEE UPDATES

Short summaries of the activity from each subcommittee were made by the Category Coordinators, with the exception of Marinas & Boating. Good progress is being made in all areas, in spite of the difficulty of the task. Some consistency still needs to be achieved across the Category boundaries for the various Objectives and other suggestions were made as listed below. Providing consistency and decisions regarding the suggestions will be part of the process and an advisory responsibility of the subcommittees.

Some suggestions were made as follows:

- There are a number of activities in agricultural subsurface drainage taking place with DWR and CALFED at a minimum. There needs to be a MM objective and perhaps a Category objective reflective of this fact. Information on these activities needs to be included in the database by the Lead Agency.
- There should be something to reflect objectives relevant to overall MMs that are reflective of TMDL, NPDES, CEQA, LCPs and Model Lease Conditions. (Which activities exist, and should they exist, for these considerations?)
- An effort should be made to reinstitute the activities of the Education/Outreach and Budget/Finance Subcommittees. The goal of the former could be to help provide a statewide

message regarding the importance of NPS pollution prevention for administrators and the general public.

V. NEXT STEPS FOR 5-YEAR PLANNING

The schedule for the development of the 5-year plan was also discussed and one change was made relative to the completion of the first draft of the 5-Year Implementation Plan. The deadline date for submittal of that draft to SWRCB was changed from November 15 to December 16, 2002. There were no other changes made.

The importance of receiving a transmittal letter from the various agencies when their *final* NPS Plans are submitted (next spring) was also discussed. There are two reasons for this transmittal formality. The first is to provide a record that the information was submitted, and link that to the specifics of the agency submittal as well as to document the submittal date. The other purpose that this transmittal letter could provide a greater awareness within the agency, and their signatory individuals, of the importance of the NPS Program Plan.

There will be differences across the agencies as to which staff or management level individuals will be signing such a transmittal letter. But it is important to begin to think about this process right now, as it is clear that some agencies will require a greater 'approval' time for their submittal.

Meeting adjourned, 14:55.